

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mamie Jackson,)	
)	C/A No. 3:15-5092-MBS
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Central Midlands Regional Transit)	
Authority, Robert Schneider, as an)	
individual and as Director of CMRTA,)	
and Taneisha Goodson, as an individual)	
and employee of Transdev,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Mamie Jackson, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a complaint on December 30, 2015, alleging that Defendants discriminated against her because of her race, gender, age, and socioeconomic status, and retaliated against her for filing complaints against Defendant Central Midlands Regional Transit Authority (CMRTA). See 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1981. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pretrial handling.

The Magistrate Judge reviewed the complaint in accordance with applicable law. On February 19, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which she determined that Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable § 1983 claim, in that Plaintiff failed to allege facts to show a violation of her constitutional rights. The Magistrate Judge further found that § 1981 provides no private right of action against government entities and actors. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's complaint be summarily dismissed. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). This court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. Id. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The court has thoroughly reviewed the record. The court concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates the Report and Recommendation herein by reference. The within complaint is summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina

March 21, 2016

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.